81

Secretary Baker

Current
Policy
No. 1181

After the NATO Summit: Challenges for the West in a Changing World

United States Department of State
Bureau of Public Affairs
Washington, D.C.

Following is an address by Secretary Baker before the National Press Club, Washington, D.C., June 8, 1989.

I know that most of you know that on NATO's 40th anniversary, we, the United States, and our allies renewed our commitment to collective defense, and we renewed our commitment to democratic values. But we did more than that. We also committed ourselves to an ambitious mission for the years ahead, and that mission is to make from a divided Europe, a new Europe, a Europe that is whole, a Europe that is free, and a Europe that is secure. This mission, of course, has far-reaching security, political, and economic implications for NATO but also for the West as a whole.

NATO's Security Proposals

So let me begin with the security proposals which we discussed at the 40th anniversary of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. From its inception, NATO has sought to protect the West's democratic values by preventing war. It's been very, very successful. The Soviet threat has imposed on the members of the alliance a significant burden of defense, but, through four sometimes tense decades, we have been able to avoid armed conflict.

Now a combination of Western strength and pressing economic problems within the Soviet Union appears to have convinced Moscow that the arms buildup really leads us nowhere. All NATO leaders acknowledge that a ray of hope has dawned—hope that Europe, the most heavily armed continent in the world, can really begin to disarm; hope that through negotiation and responsible action by governments, ways can be found to make all of us safer at lower levels of risk. But, I think we should all recognize that the dawn is not the day. That's why the President advanced proposals at the summit to bring us closer to that day when the shadow of still-threatening Soviet conventional advantages will be lifted.

The President's Conventional Parity Initiative promises to accelerate and lock in a potentially historic change in the balance of military forces in Europe. If accepted by the East, this initiative would reduce the size of NATO, and it would reduce the Warsaw Pact's conventional forces to equal and stable levels. These levels would substantially reduce the threat of surprise military attack and substantially reduce the danger of large-scale offensive operations against Western Europe.

I want to add here an observation about the summit process and about NATO itself. This summit, I think, showed beyond a shadow of a doubt that the alliance does have the flexibility to change while at the same time preserving and even enhancing its core principles and values. NATO's agreement on a comprehensive concept, including an agreement on short-range nuclear forces (SNF), demonstrates that we can maintain deterrence under new and changing political conditions.

In light of the conventional imbalances, the alliance agreed that the short-range nuclear forces negotiations leading to *partial* nuclear reductions would begin but only—and this is very important—only after the implementation of a conventional forces agreement is underway. We and our NATO partners further agreed that any short-range nuclear forces reductions will not be implemented—they'll not be carried out—until the results of the conventional forces agreement have been implemented.

The economic and the political consequences of the President's security initiatives are far reaching and profound. If the Soviet Union truly wishes to channel needed resources from the military to the civilian sector, then these new proposals surely offer the opportunity. If the Soviet Union truly wishes the process of political reform in Eastern Europe to proceed freely, then the removal of 325,000 troops will surely reduce fears of Soviet military intervention.

These proposals point clearly to a long-term, dramatic transformation in Europe's strategic and political landscape. The time is ripe for General Secretary Gorbachev to respond positively to the opportunities presented by these initiatives. Indeed, we look for him to do so when he travels to the Federal Republic of Germany next week.

As the alliance came to agreement on the SNF issue last week, we added

READEX FICHE best copy available

1.21/4:

an important call to the Soviet Union: We urged the Soviets to reduce unilaterally their short-range nuclear systems to NATO levels. Next week, the General Secretary can sustain this new spirit by answering this call and by announcing a real cut in Soviet short-range nuclear forces. But whatever Mr. Gorbachev's response, I think we should remember that the West's efforts are aimed at removing more than just Soviet divisions; they are aimed, in fact, at removing the division of Europe itself.

Beyond Containment to a New Europe

The Brussels summit also affirmed that NATO's mission goes beyond the military dimension of East-West relations. We want, as the President has said, to move beyond containment to a new Europe—a Europe that is whole, and a Europe that is free. That Europe is defined by a community of free nations from which no one is excluded. Its borders are set not by geography or barbed wire but by the reach of democratic freedoms. Its pursuits are the ways of peace, and it grows through the force of ideas. Today, it stretches from Montreal, San Francisco, and Rome to Tokyo, Helsinki, and Melbourne.

It is the community for which Chinese students have sacrificed their lives on the hard pavement of Tiananmen Square. It is the community of thought to which Sakharov belongs. It is the model in the minds of Hungarians and Poles as they strive to hammer out social compacts between government and the governed.

NATO has signaled its intention to engage in political and economic outreach to the East. We and our alliance partners realize that the cold war which began with the Iron Curtain and continued with the Berlin Wall can really only be ended there. It can only be ended when imposed barriers no longer separate East and West—East and West Europeans, East and West Germans, East and West Berliners.

Therefore, we've called upon the East to bring down the wall that makes our common European home a house which is really divided against its will. And, as an expression of our determination to increase contact and cooperation, NATO reiterated its commitment to improve the quality of life for Berlin's inhabitants through the allied Berlin initiative. This effort seeks to make *all* of Berlin a free and prosperous city—a symbol of a Europe that is itself free and whole.

The President has offered five new proposals that would help overcome the division of Europe by fostering the spread of democratic ideas and the decentralization of political and economic authority in the East.

First, in the economic sphere, the President seeks to encourage private initiative and private institutions in the East. We want to make sure, of course, that we avoid the costly mistakes of the 1970s, when we allowed unproductive public sector debt to accumulate. The European Community is becoming a magnet for the East; in effect, an agent for change. We urge the European Community to reach out toward Eastern Europe, particularly after 1992, when Western Europe becomes a single unified market.

Second, in the political sphere, the President seeks to encourage greater political freedom. That can best be done through contacts with free press associations, universities, trade unions, and other organizations that have sprung up in the East. He has asked Western counterparts to establish ties with these new groups. We have experience; they have the need; and we can both benefit from the new relationship.

Third, the President has urged the free political parties of Western Europe and the United States to establish relations and help foster new parties in the East.

Fourth, the President has called for self-determination for all of Germany and for all of Eastern Europe. He has urged that the question of free elections be placed prominently on the agenda for meetings of the Helsinki signatory states. The world cannot fully enter a new age of normalized relations between East and West until the peoples of all nations can freely choose their own destinies.

And **fifth,** the President has proposed that East and West work together on environmental problems. Can there be any greater symbol of the promise and the problems that East and West face together than the Chernobyl nuclear disaster? A supreme technological achievement, when you think about it, the unlocking of nuclear energy, was mocked by the failure of those who designed and ran the plant to control it. Instead of pointing the finger of blame for this and other pollutions of our environment, we extend, instead, the hand of cooperation. We can offer training, assistance in drafting laws and regulations—in short, our whole experience in dealing with these issues. And we can look to develop joint projects to control the pollution that knows no walls or borders and that threatens the health and beauty of Europe.

Forty years ago, we and our NATO partners pledged to "safeguard the common heritage and civilization" of Europe against our common enemies. As the President pointed out, Europe's environment is the common heritage of all Europeans, and we must all work to protect it. Defending Europe's environment from the threat of pollution is just another way for the West to fulfill NATO's mission of making Europe safe and making Europe whole.

President Bush's July trip to Poland and Hungary prior to the Paris economic summit demonstrates his seriousness about reaching out to Eastern nations. The President is convinced that the East can progress only through both political and economic change. To stand in the way of such necessary, historic change—as we are seeing to our outrage and sorrow in China—is to turn one's back on the future.

Beyond Europe to the Global Community

That future promises to be a demanding one for all nations—even ours in the West with proven political and economic track records. From the beginning, we and our Western allies recognized that our efforts to prevent war and to advance democratic values on the European Continent were really fundamental to world peace.

Today, as tensions ease in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, the President and other NATO leaders acknowledge that the West must begin to turn more attention to other areas of concern to the world community. Together, we and our allies met the daunting challenges of a postwar world. So today, as that postwar era is succeeded by new times, we really must tackle a new and a different set of challenges, and I want to cite three of those in particular.

First, we face a series of regional problems that, if untended, can affect nations near and far with grim consequences. Perhaps it's time for our friends and alliance partners to consider mechanisms to deal collectively with these regional conflicts. For example, working bilaterally and in parallel with several of our European allies, we and other nations responded very effectively when Iran's actions threatened vital shipping lanes in the Persian Gulf.

Second, the spread of ballistic missiles, chemical weapons, and possibly even nuclear weapons to countries engaged in regional conflicts is very, very dangerous. The trends are very alarming. At least 15 developing nations could be producing their own ballistic missiles by the year 2000. The spread of these missiles will put states in volatile regions on hair triggers and will increase their incentives to acquire or deploy chemical or nuclear weapons. Can there be any doubt that such developments constitute an increasing danger to world peace? The time is growing short for effective approaches to deal with these problems. Further steps—both individual and collective—are necessary to strengthen international barriers to proliferation. We must continue to support the nuclear nonproliferation regime, and we must strengthen the Missile Technology Control Regime. Building on the work of the recently concluded Paris conference on chemical weapons, we must continue our joint efforts toward banning these weapons of terror.

And, **finally,** like the problems of proliferation, transnational dangers such as environmental hazards, terrorism, and the drug trade ultimately respect no political boundaries. They pose new threats. But they also create opportunities for creative responsibility sharing and cooperation where none existed before.

The President discussed all of these points at the summit in Brussels, and we have been gratified by the response. The NATO leaders agreed to consult and to coordinate among themselves with respect to these issues, and we will continue to lead the allies in working toward solving these very, very pressing problems.

Creative Responsibility Sharing

Finally, I want to discuss a very important concept that the President broached at the summit. The best way, we think, to proceed with our alliance partners—indeed, with all nations—in this changing world is to engage in what the President has called "creative responsibility sharing."

In the past, we heard a lot about "burdensharing," which was a concept that at first, at least, was narrowly applied to defense cooperation within our alliance system. And, in the defense area, many of our European partners *are* working toward a more efficient European defense industry. We endorse these efforts, particularly those of the Independent European Program Group and the West European Union to develop wider armaments cooperation. And, by continuing our own efforts to stimulate codevelopment projects, the United States will promote joint armaments development and production and over time will improve efficiencies and reduce the costs of defense.

But, "creative responsibility sharing" is really a broader concept than burdensharing. It embraces issues such as how we define threats to our security, how we divide up responsibilities, and who we engage in responsibility sharing. It applies to a broad range of issues on the international agenda.

Today, for instance, we must think more broadly about how we define "security" in the long term. Environmental concerns violate the integrity of Europe. Conflicts around the world—regional conflicts—threaten the supply of vital resources to our Atlantic and Pacific allies. Chemical and ballistic missile proliferation pose dangers to the entire world community—to our allies, friends, and adversaries alike.

So the West must consider how best to divide responsibility for our wider security needs among our friends and among our alliance partners. We must learn to pool our various strengths. Countries having differing capabilities, experiences, and know-how can lend each of these capabilities, experiences, and know-how toward meeting the security challenges which we together face. I think, for example, that some countries, given their historical involvement in particular regions, can play key diplomatic roles to resolve conflicts. Still others, I believe, are well-placed to help with problems of economic development and problems of debt.

An expanding global economy, development in the Third World, and the resolution of Third World conflicts are all critical to global progress. Already, our Pacific ally Japan is using its great wealth to foster economic development in the Third World. I would note, of course, that everyone bears a responsibility to contribute to global growth.

Clearly, I think we must also think creatively about the private sector's role in efforts that can contribute to our security. For example, as I mentioned earlier, we can facilitate private efforts by Western trade unions, businesses, industry, and the scientific community that would foster political and economic reform in Eastern Europe.

Conclusion

So let me sum up where I think NATO and the West stand today in relation to the challenges of a changing world.

NATO has always—not always been perceived to be—but has always been more than simply a military arrangement. It began as a community of nations sharing a common vision of Europe, a vision of free peoples working peacefully together to advance democracy. Now we have very nearly achieved that vision. Western Europe, today, is a model of democratic values. It's an economic giant, and it is a pillar of Western security.

In Brussels, the leaders of NATO committed themselves to the next mission—to bring about a whole Europe and a free Europe, as I said at the beginning of my remarks. Even as we protect the West's security, we must marshal our combined military, diplomatic, and economic strengths in order to reach out to the East. That is because the Soviets and many of their allies are engaged in new thinking—really, I guess we should say *rethinking*—of their failed policies. The walls of ideological dogma are collapsing and with them the old order of a rigidly divided Europe. Opportunities are now opening for the East to rejoin the mainstream of European and international life.

At the anniversary summit, therefore, we and our allies made the *next* 40 years, *not* the last 40 years, our point of reference. We forged, I think it's fair to say, a new basis for unity. We advanced toward our objectives of making war both unthinkable and impossible. And, we have set a new course so that the alliance and the nations of the West can bridge at last the East-West divide.

As we in the West look into the future, we rekindle our hope for a Europe that is free and a Europe that is whole. And, as we approach a new century, we renew our commitment to work with all nations to make the world a far, far better place.■

Published by the United States Department of State • Bureau of Public Affairs
Office of Public Communication • Editorial Division • Washington, D.C. • June 1989
Editor: Sharon R. Haynes • This material is in the public domain and may be reprinted without permission; citation of this source is appreciated.

PA/OAP, Rm. 5815A
United States Department of State
Washington, D.C. 20520

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE $300

Address Correction Requested

BULK RATE
POSTAGE & FEES PAID
U.S. Department of State
Permit No. G–130